

Meeting of the
Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (P&P TAC)
of the
Southern California Association of Governments

October 14, 2009

Minutes

Members and Alternates

Air Resources Board (ARB)	Ms. Terry Roberts	L
Air Resources Board (ARB) - alternate	Mr. Earl Withycombe	T
American Automobile Association (AAA)	Ms. Marianne Kim	L
American Automobile Association (AAA) - alternate	Mr. Steve Finnegan	
Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)/Mojave Desert AQMD (MDAQMD)	Mr. Alan De Salvio	
Arroyo Verdugo	Mr. Fred Zohrehvand	
Arroyo Verdugo - alternate	Mr. Greg Herrmann	
California Department of Finance	Ms. Mary Heim	E
Caltrans District 7	Ms. Leann Williams	L
Caltrans District 7 - alternate	Ms. Tahirih Smith	
Caltrans District 8	Ms. Diane Morales	R
Caltrans District 8 - alternate	Mr. James Camarillo	
Caltrans District 11	Mr. Maurice Eaton	E
Caltrans District 11 - alternate	Ms. Christine Antoine	E
Caltrans District 12	Ms. Maureen El Harake	T
Caltrans District 12 - alternate	Mr. Everett Evans	
City of Los Angeles	Mr. Miles Mitchell	L
City of Los Angeles - alternate	Mr. Jack Tsao	
Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG)	Mr. Jacob I. Alvarez	R
Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG) - alternate	Ms. Aurora Wilson	
County of Los Angeles	Mr. Mark Herwick	L
County of Los Angeles - alternate	Ms. Connie Chung	
County of Riverside	Dr. William Gayk	R
County of Riverside - alternate	Mr. JiHong McDermott	
Federal Highway Administration	Ms. Michelle Noch	L
Federal Highway Administration - alternate	Ms. Aimee Kratovil	
Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG)	Ms. Nancy Pfeffer	L
Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) - alternate	Ms. Karen Heit	
Imperial County Air Pollution Control District	Mr. Matt Dessert	
Imperial County Air Pollution Control District - alternate	Ms. Monica Soucier	
Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG)	Mr. Bob Ham	
Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG) - alternate	Ms. Rosa Lopez	
Las Virgenes/Malibu Council of Governments	Mr. Marc Seferian	L
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)	Ms. Lori Abrishami	L
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) - alternate	Ms. Sarah Jepson	
Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)	Ms. Valerie Edwards	
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Mr. Michael Hollis	
North Los Angeles County - North	Mr. Richard Kite	T
North Los Angeles County - North - alternate	Mr. Mike Behen	T

Members and Alternates (continued)

North Los Angeles County - South	Ms. Lisa Webber	L
North Los Angeles County - South - alternate	Mr. David Peterson	
Orange County Council of Governments (OCCOG)	Ms. Kristine Murray	
Orange County Council of Governments (OCCOG) - alternate	Mr. Deborah Diep	
Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)	Mr. Charlie Larwood	L
Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) - alternate	Mr. Greg Nord	L
Port of Long Beach	Mr. Eric Shen	
Port of Long Beach - alternate	Ms. Jolene Hayes	
Port of Los Angeles	Mr. Kerry Cartwright	E
Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC)	Ms. Shirley Medina	
San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG)	Mr. Ty Schuiling	E
San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) - alternate	Mr. Steve Smith	R
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG)	Mr. Bill Trimble	L
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) - alternate	Mr. Larry Stevens	
SCAG Region Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs)	Ms. Kim Uhlich	
SCAG Region Special Districts	Mr. David Cordero	E
South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG)	Ms. Kim Fuentes	L
South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) - alternate	Mr. Walter Siembab	L
South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)	Ms. Carol A. Gomez	T
South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) - alternate	Ms. Kathryn Higgins	
Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA)	Ms. Valarie McFall	L
Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA) - alternate	Mr. Sam Elters	
University of Irvine (UCI) Department of Planning, Policy & Design	Mr. Marlon Boarnet	L
Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD)	Ms. Genie McGaugh	T
Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) - alternate	Mr. Alan Ballard	
Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) / Ventura Council of Governments (VCOG)	Mr. Steve DeGeorge	L
Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG)	Mr. Kevin Viera	L
Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) - alternate	Ms. Danielle Coats	
Westside Cities Council of Governments	Ms. Diana Chang	T
Westside Cities Council of Governments - alternate	Ms. Martha Eros	

Non-Members

Carla Walecka Planning	Ms. Carla Walecka	L
City of Burbank	Mr. Mike Labudski	L
City of Irvine	Ms. Marika Modugno	L
City of Mission Viejo	Ms. Gail Shiomoto-Lohr	L
City of Ontario	Mr. Richard Ayala	L
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)	Mr. Brad McAllester	L
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)	Ms. Desiree P. Rabinov	L

SCAG Staff

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr.	Naresh	Amatya	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr.	Mark	Butala	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr.	Ryan	Kuo	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr.	Jacob	Lieb	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr.	Jonathan	Nadler	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr.	Frank	Wen	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) consultant	Ms.	Susan	DeSantis	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) consultant (System Metrics Group)	Mr.	Tarek	Hatata	L

Key:

(L) In person–LA (R) In person–Riverside (X) In person–Other (T) Teleconference
(E) Excused Absence * Represented by temporary alternate

1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order at 1:33 pm. by Charlie Larwood, OCTA, P&P TAC Chair.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Gail Shiimoto-Lohr, City of Mission Viejo, offered comments regarding the “*Draft Sustainable Communities Strategy Collaborative Process*” attachment of September 25, 2009, which was included in the October 14, 2009 P&P TAC Agenda packet:

- 1) If a subregion does elect to prepare and adopt a subregional SCS inclusive of the growth forecast, can SCAG alter this SCS and growth forecast when it merges the subregional SCS into the regional SCS, or is the subregional SCS taken as is?
- 2) In the collaborative strategy (page 12 of the Agenda packet, page 6 of the strategy), a statement reads: “Consistent with SB 375 requirements, the growth forecast for year 2020 will represent the RHNA allocation by jurisdiction.” If the regional SCS does represent a land use distribution and plan for the Regional Transportation Plan, would the RHNA allocation be by jurisdiction only and not by a smaller geography such as the census tract or the SCAG traffic analysis zone (which is how the growth forecasts are developed and aggregated)? We want to ensure that jurisdictions do not have an overly optimistic or false sense of security as we prepare these growth forecasts, and later on end up with an inconsistency issue as they update their housing element strategy.

3.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - CONTINUED

- 3) In the “*Draft Sustainable Communities Strategy Collaborative Process*” attachment, we wanted to clarify the status of the conceptual land-use scenario (CLUS). For example, on page 19 of the Agenda packet, it says that you will have a series of workshops with stakeholders and public hearings with the focus of developing a strategy and cost issues that will “augment and enhance the preliminary baseline CLUS developed by SCAG staff.” Another section on page 19 says that “the subsequent workshops in phase three will build in the preliminary CLUS scenario developed by SCAG and this will continue through 2011.” So the question is does the CLUS still exist? Is it, for example, described by another phrase or term from one of the alternative planning scenarios that are to be developed as part of the RTP or is it gone?
- 4) In reference to page 23 of your Agenda packet, and the discussion about “Best Management Practices” (BMPs): The CARB RTAC report identifies an extension discussion about the BMP list, and how it should be developed and finalized in the next four to six months. The report also indicates that the BMP list would be needed by January 2010 to help inform the target-setting process. One question we had was that given the 2010 recommendation that is identified in the CARB RTAC report, given the importance of BMP strategies that are identified, should the P&P TAC group here start now the discussion of BMPs and specifically those BMPs which are able to be identified to have the empirical data or the greenhouse gas emissions targets instead seems to be an integral element to the SCS development.
- 5) The environmental justice analysis (page 27 of the Agenda packet) states that SCAG will prepare an environmental justice analysis and includes a comment that “one common concern about TOD development is their potential gentrification effects on the minority and local income populations around transit stations and transportation corridors.” A particularly compelling discussion in the CARB RTAC report mentioned that there are also health impacts—specifically air quality—that are associated with siting housing around or near transportation corridors and transit stations (page 31 of the CARB RTAC report). We thought that this issue—which is defined as “the public health risk caused by existing air particulates in these same areas”—is something that should also be considered in the environmental justice analysis.

Jacob Lieb, SCAG Staff, responded that SCAG would like to take these comments and questions for review, and provide prepared responses at a later time.

4.0 REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

5.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

5.1 Approval Items

5.1.1 Minutes of September 9, 2009 P&P TAC Meeting

The minutes from the P&P TAC meeting of September 9, 2009, were approved with the following edits on page 5 requested by Terry Roberts, ARB: "Terry Roberts, ARB, stated that ARB has to identify a draft regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction target by June ~~130~~, 2010. In order to honor the RTAC recommendation for a bottoms-up approach to target setting, ARB would need to come up with a preliminary draft target several months prior to June ~~30~~, so there can be dialogue with the MPOs before determining an official draft target. That's why ARB wanted to release the preliminary draft target by the January or February 2010 timeframe, which ~~would probably understandably might~~ create logistical difficulties for MPOs to develop their own discussions."

6.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.1 I-405/I-210 CSMP

Tarek Hatata, SCAG Consultant, made a presentation and provided a handout on "*Corridor System Management Plans*," expanding his discussion beyond the I-405/I-210 Corridor System Management Plans (CSMPs) to include all the CSMPs SCAG is involved with in the Southern California area. While acknowledging the importance of large capital expansion projects such as new highways and transit, Mr. Hatata emphasized that operational improvements and transportation management could also have a significant impact on traffic congestion at a much lower cost, producing a higher return on investment. Recognition of this fact resulted in SCAG's 2008 RTP allocating a greater share of funding to operational strategies, and is also reflected in the development of CSMPs, including SCAG's I-210 and I-405 Plans in conjunction with Caltrans and Plans in various Southern California counties and cities (focusing on I-5 in LA; SR-57, SR-22, I-405, and SR-91 in Orange County; I-10, I-215, and SR-91 in the Inland Empire). In particular, SCAG's CSMP work focuses on finding ways to reduce the greatest source of highway congestion at the targeted highways: recurring bottlenecks, which are responsible for 50% to 60% of congestion. The traffic model developed in the process will provide important trend information about how well SCAG's investments into various operational strategies (e.g., increased integrated land use, congestion pricing, and HOV) have performed which will be incorporated into the 2012 RTP. Mr. Hatata also stressed the importance of having the 2012 RTP include specific improvement projects for the CSMP corridors to minimize the risk of budget cuts as has happened to non-specific

projects in the past. He noted that while implementation of SB 375 emphasizes greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction, it will also reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which will also reduce traffic congestion.

Charlie Larwood, OCTA, P&P TAC Chair, asked whether long-term vehicular CSMPs will be incorporated into the Transportation Concept Reports produced by Caltrans.

Nancy Pfeffer, Gateway Cities COG, asked what other impacts might result from a reduction in the time cost of driving or increase the travel time savings.

Reflecting on the graph which showed that the recession had caused travel demand to decrease, Wally Siembab, South Bay Cities COG, questioned whether most of the freeway congestion was coming from vehicles driving to work. He also wanted to know what percent reduction would be needed in demand from freeway space to eliminate all bottlenecks and have free-flowing traffic all of the time.

Naresh Amatya, SCAG Staff, closed this item by remarking that each RTP cycle has a dominant theme, and with this RTP the central issue is how to maximize the existing assets that we have before we look at other options like adding capacity.

5.2 SCS Data Format

Frank Wen, SCAG Staff, provided a handout on SCAG's "*2012 RTP/SCS Development*" as a supporting document for his presentation describing the data format to be used for Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) development. SCAG Staff Frank Wen discussed SB375 and its implications for the 2012 RTP. His presentation focused on the growth and land use related requirement for the development of the SCS. The updated growth forecasting process started in March 2009. A panel of experts was convened to look at the most recent demographic and economic data. The growth forecast was presented to the CEHD in July, after which the outreach process started. As of today, SCAG has covered about 120 local jurisdictions—about 62% of the region. The outreach process is continuing with upcoming meetings with the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (COG), Gateway Cities COG, Coachella Valley Association of Governments, and the Western Riverside COG. Mr. Wen emphasized that the current phase of growth forecasting and SCS development is target setting and developing recommendations. SCAG is taking comments and input from the total jurisdictions, which will then be incorporated into the growth forecast. It is anticipated that by the spring of next year, SCAG will accumulate all of the local input and run a model to recommend a greenhouse gas emission reduction target for ARB's consideration to adopt.

The focus now is on identifying the general location of land uses, residential densities, and building intensities in the region, and working with local jurisdictions to make sure that that information is correct. The SCS will identify areas within the region that can house population growth and housing projections. Mr. Wen emphasized that everyone should be following the statewide effort regarding the RTP Guidelines Update, which includes a discussion of the modeling requirements and expectations, land use data, and, very importantly, the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). Currently SCAG staff is evaluating the interactions between the SCS document and the RHNA process.

The SCS is primarily focused on growth distribution. There are core objectives that need to be met, one of which is to capture the intra-TAZ transportation benefits from land use changes. Currently, SCAG's transportation model does not capture that information. It is important to be able to capture land use changes happening at the finer geographic scales, particularly the parcel level. SCAG still is working with local jurisdictions on a continual basis to meet the requirements of SCS adoption.

Ms. Gail Shimoto-Lohr, City of Mission Viejo, asked in regards to the transit priority areas, if the areas had been geographically identified by SCAG and, if so, if they are available.

Mr. Wen said that SB 375 is very specific regarding the definition of transit priority project areas. It includes all of what is in a half-mile radius of rail stations, bus transit stops, and corridors with a fixed bus route. According to that definition, SCAG Staff did prepare the coverage of these transit priority project areas. Future planned stations in the last RTP have been mapped. In the future, those maps will be provided online on SCAG's FTP site for local jurisdictions to download.

Jacob Alvarez, Coachella Valley Association of Governments, asked how SCAG is handling the Bureau of Land Management land. Mr. Alvarez stated that there is a significant amount in his area and that some of it will be used for some solar projects – he wondered how that would be incorporated, if at all.

Mr. Wen responded that he didn't know, and that he would follow up with SCAG staff and report back on this.

5.3 RTP/SB 375 Outreach

5.3.1 SB 375 Message

Jacob Lieb, SCAG Staff, and Susan DeSantis, SCAG Consultant, led a discussion about the SB 375 Message as part of an overall conversation about SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/SB 375 Outreach efforts. Key points raised by Mr. Lieb and Ms. DeSantis: 1) SCAG is now moving into an outreach phase in which it will need to more carefully craft its SB 375 message to educate and appeal to broader audiences by emphasizing themes like choice, the future of the region, and co-benefits like public health; 2) It is critical for this RTP development cycle to make a clear connection between sustainability and transportation choice, and the Southern California region's economic recovery as it transitions to new types of economic engines; 3) SCAG will also need to tailor its message to address specific subregional needs and concerns like job creation and protecting the environment, while working with the subregions to assist them in developing customized sustainable community strategies; and 4) Use of some of the tools and techniques applied in the last presidential campaign to reach people who are not typically engaged is being considered to engage local communities which may be uninterested in the issue of sustainability. Mr. Lieb added that materials related to SCAG's outreach efforts in relation to the SB 375 message would be presented to the P&P TAC at a future meeting for member comments and questions.

P&P TAC members raised concerns about how to overcome the challenge of getting local communities interested in and supportive of the concept of sustainability. Proposed possible solutions including putting greater emphasis on the connection between sustainability and maintaining quality of life, and pointing out potential positive impacts by referring to such things as studies showing a connection between improved transit access and increased property values.

5.3.2 Growth Forecast Outreach Phase

Frank Wen, SCAG Staff, provided an update on the growth forecast outreach efforts. Mr. Wen stated that by the end of this month, SCAG hopes to talk to every local jurisdiction in the SCAG region. The next step will be to host the next round of workshops or meetings with individual cities and subregions. SCAG staff is currently working with local jurisdictions about their land use strategies. So far, all local jurisdictions are giving their best efforts to provide SCAG modeling staff with the needed land use information in order to document those land use changes, comparing their general land use plan from two years ago to the existing general plan, to

their projected general plan, in order to begin the process of capturing those benefits in terms of emission reductions.

There is broad consensus across all local jurisdictions moving forward to align with the RTAC recommendations in terms of the 2020/2035 emission reduction on a per capita basis, using a 2005 base year. SCAG is working to wrap up the first-phase comment input by the end of this month, and develop the General Plan Base Growth Forecast land-use scenario by November. Then, we will separately develop the trend baseline. Once SCAG has developed a consensus General Plan Base Growth Forecast, SCAG will continue to work with local jurisdictions.

5.4 Base Year Discussion

Frank Wen, SCAG Staff, led a discussion concerning the implications of using 2005 as the base year for SB 375 greenhouse gas (GHG) target-setting. The RTAC recommendation is to use the 2020/2035 target setting expressed on a per capita basis as a percentage reduction from the 2005 base year. Using this hypothetical scenario, each bar (in the final PowerPoint slide) represents a different scenario. The first one is the base year 2005, assumed in some MPO regions, the average weekday per capita CO₂ emissions from passenger cars, because SB 375 focuses on passenger and light-duty trucks. This is 21.7 pounds per person, using 2035 and assuming that the RTP Baseline per capita CO₂ emissions from a passenger car on a weekday is 22 pounds per day, which represents a 1.3% increase on a per capita basis. If the RTP Baseline is 2035, that per capita is derived from the Baseline infrastructure investments, and the growth forecast. Through the RTP/SCS strategy development, the hypothetical MPO will be able to reduce on a per capita basis from 22 without any strategy plan through their RTP and SCS efforts in 2035 down to 21.6 CO₂ pounds per capita per weekday. That represents about a 1.82% reduction on a per capita basis between the 2035 between the plan and the no project or baseline situation with the RTP and SCS output.

Mr. Wen stated, that in his opinion, the question of base year 2005 or base year 2008 loses relevance when one realizes that the key factor is the growth forecast in 2020, 2035, and the difference that the region can achieve with the different land use scenarios, investment scenarios, as well as what emission reductions impacts can be achieved. Comparisons can be made with 2005 or 2020 or 2035, as long as there is agreement on how to estimate the total emissions and divide by the population. Then, on an annualized basis, we can convert and estimate the per capita base emissions.

Mr. Wen stated that it is important to collectively work with region-wide input, looking at different investments and different growth, what kind of emission reductions that will result in—that will, in turn, help inform what kind of per capita basis assumptions can be made.

In response to a question posed by Miles Mitchell, City of Los Angeles, Mr. Wen discussed the trend baseline, which he is working on to capture what many local jurisdictions have provided input on. SCAG derived the trend baseline, which took out the recent actions by local jurisdictions. So, assuming that cities don't do anything, then this is the development pattern and land use in their general plan, and the land use benefits that will be captured. For many local jurisdictions, their current updated general plan represents their SCS strategies, and then there are a handful of other local jurisdictions that have additional strategies that they are planning to adopt. SCAG is working to try to capture that as well.

Another question was posed in regards to the per capita difference shown for 2005 versus 2035. Is this a result of cleaner, more efficient cars? Mr. Wen responded that these are hypothetical figures which are borrowed from the weighted average of all of the data that each MPO provided to the ARB. The ARBs collect information from across the whole state. Moving into the future, those emissions will be greatly reduced because of the two regulations. So yes, one is fuel technology, the other is car efficiency.

Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr inquired about how the per-capita percentage reduction for GHG emissions relates to the original 1990-to-2025 million metric figure that was originally identified in the ARB scoping plan. She encouraged SCAG to provide some type of benchmark so that they can see the relationship to that original number and then be able to understand it with respect to the current proposal going from 2005 to 2035. Mr. Wen stated that is to address to the RTAC recommendation. When it eventually comes out, the ARB would provide a greenhouse gas emission target for each MPO that will be a uniform per-capita reduction relative to the base year 2005 level.

5.5 SB 375 Collaborative Process

Jacob Lieb, SCAG Staff, presented the latest revision (as of September 25, 2009) of the *"Draft Sustainable Communities Strategy Collaborative Process"* document. He indicated that this document had been revised to include feedback given by the P&P TAC at its last meeting, but had not yet been updated to reflect subsequent comments expressed by the Community, Economic, and Human Development (CEHD) Committee in its October 2009 meeting. Most notably, the CEHD requested that the discussion of subregional targets be eliminated. Mr. Lieb stated that this change will be implemented as it makes sense in light of the

terms of the collaborative process and the direction that's indicated at the statewide level by the RTAC report. In addition, P&P TAC members will continue to be able to provide questions and comments on this draft document to us on a rolling and ongoing basis. For these reasons, further revisions to the draft document will be forthcoming.

[Note: At this time, Gail Shiimoto-Lohr provided five comments related to the SCS collaborative process and the draft document which appear under the "Public Comment Period" section of these minutes.]

7.0 STAFF REPORT

Ryan Kuo, SCAG Staff, reported that the Draft 2008 RTP Amendment #2 was released on October 1st by the Transportation Committee, and will be out for public review until November 6th. Mr. Kuo indicated that the document was available on the SCAG website and that copies are available upon request. Mr. Kuo also reported that the P&P TAC did not have a set date for the next meeting, and that SCAG Staff would like to propose a future meeting schedule that would extend until June 2010. It was proposed that, in order to avoid any single conflict, the P&P TAC meeting dates would alternate between the second Wednesday afternoon of the month and the second Tuesday of the month. According to this schedule, the next meeting would take place on the second Tuesday of next month, or November 10th, at 1:30 p.m. Mr. Kuo stated that he would e-mail the proposed schedule to all members, and welcomed any comments and suggestions via e-mail reply.

8.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

There were several items proposed for discussion under a future agenda. Wally Siembab, South Bay Cities COG, requested that SCAG Staff: 1) discuss its reaction to the RTAC report; 2) provide an actual example of how the development types presented last time are supposed to be used; 3) provide the inputs and the outputs to the various models that are in one of the appendices to the collaborative process—what the inputs are and what the subregions will get out it; and 4) offer a status report on the collaboration between SCAG and the AIR District as the AIR District works to compile a list of Best Management Practices in conjunction with PR 2301 to assist with the establishment of one set of Best Management Practices throughout the region. Charlie Larwood, OCTA, P&P TAC Chair, offered that some of these items could be discussed at the subcommittee as appropriate.

Terry Roberts (Air Resources Board) proposed that P&P TAC also discuss the new RTP Guidelines that are being developed by the California Transportation.

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee will be held on Tuesday, November 10, 2009, from 1:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m. at the SCAG Main Office in Los Angeles.